

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 249547
ORIGIN ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EUR-12 SP-02 INT-05 PM-05 DODE-00
CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02
OMB-01 PA-01 PRS-01 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00
USIE-00 INRE-00 /081 R

DRAFTED BY:ACDA/ISP/REG:RRSTRAND; EUR/RPM:PSBWIER
APPROVED BY:EUR/RPM:SJLEDOGAR
ACDA:MHUMPHREYS
EUR/RPM:JCKORNBLUM
OSD/ISA:TPHDUNLOP (DRAFT)
S/P:PSKAPLAN
EUR/CE:NLAUDERDALE
INT/PMT:RHBARAZ
PM/DCA:WCVEALE

-----109284 191229Z /50/14

O 180156Z OCT 77
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE
INFO CSCE COLLECTIVE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 249547

BELGRADE ALSO FOR USDEL CSCE

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (PARA 8 LINE 3 OMITTED)
E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS: OCTOBER 18 POLADS MEETING

REFS (NOTAL): A) USNATO 9797; B) USNATO 9707;
C) STATE 197382; D) STATE 239233; E) USNATO 9466;
F) USNATO 8795; G) STATE 218519

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 249547

1. WE ARE NOW SEEKING TO CONCLUDE ALLIED DEVELOPMENT OF
OPENING CBMS POSITIONS FOR BELGRADE. THIS MESSAGE
DISCUSSES THE ALLIED MOVEMENTS CBM POSITION. WE ARE
PREPARING SEPTELS WITH US VIEWS ON POST-BELGRADE CBMS
WORKING GROUP, SWEDISH MILITARY EXPENDITURES REPORTING
INITIATIVE AND LOCUS FOR ALLIED CBMS CONSULTATIONS;
COORDINATED MANEUVERS INITIATIVE; CANADIAN PAPER ON
MILITARY ASPECTS OF DETENTE; JCS PAPER ON CBMS;
REVISED SWEDISH DRAFT RESOLUTION; NORWEGIAN PROPOSAL FOR
TABLING ISD/156; AND ON WARSAW PACT NFU PROPOSAL.

MISSION IS REQUESTED TO INFORM DEPARTMENT SOONEST IF THERE ARE ANY OTHER TOPICS TO BE COVERED.

2. FYI. FLORA LEWIS REPORTED FROM BELGRADE IN SUNDAY, OCTOBER 16 NEW YORK TIMES THAT CONSENSUS SEEMS TO BE

SHAPING AMONG SMALLER CSCE PARTICIPANTS (NORWAY, SWEDEN AND ROMANIA) FOR LOWERING OF CBM MANEUVERS THRESHOLD AND FOR AN INITIATIVE ON MOVEMENTS. END FYI.

3. CONSTRUCTIVE AND DETAILED ALLIED DISCUSSION (REFTELS A AND B) OF U.S. DRAFT MOVEMENTS PAPER HAS BEEN MOST HELPFUL TO OUR OWN CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUE AND TO OUR DESIRE, AS THE NATO PARTNER WITH THE LARGEST NUMBER OF PERSONNEL MOVING IN AND OUT OF THE AREA, TO COOPERATE IN ENSURING THAT THE ALLIANCE WILL HAVE A FULLY COORDINATED POSITION ON A MOVEMENTS CBM AT BELGRADE.

4. AS A RESULT OF THESE DISCUSSIONS, WE CONCLUDE THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD SEEK TO BE POSITIVE ON A MOVEMENTS CBM INITIATIVE AT BELGRADE. ALLIED ADVANCE OF SUCH AN INITIATIVE WOULD, HOWEVER, REPRESENT TOO MUCH OF AN "EVENT". IT WOULD PUT THE ALLIES IN THE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 249547

POSITION OF HAVING TO DEFEND A MOVEMENTS POSITION, RATHER THAN HAVING THE OPTION OF ESPOUSING OTHER INITIATIVE CRITIQUING IT OR SUGGESTING AN ALTERNATIVE OF OUR OWN. ADVANCING AN INITIATIVE COULD, MORE IMPORTANTLY, PLACE THE ALLIES IN AN UNDESIRE TACTICAL SITUATION AT BELGRADE. FOR EXAMPLE, WE WOULD LIKELY SOON BE FACED WITH THE NECESSITY OF REJECTING REQUESTS BY OTHER CSCE PARTICIPANTS TO ENLARGE OUR MOVEMENTS INITIATIVE BEYOND LIMITS DETERMINED BY NATO FLEXIBILITY AND PREPAREDNESS.

5. WE THUS CONCLUDE FURTHER THAT THE BEST ALLIED TACTIC AT BELGRADE WOULD BE TO SUPPORT, IN PRINCIPLE, A MOVEMENTS CBM INITIATIVE ADVANCED BY ONE, OR A GROUP OF NNAS. IN THIS CONNECTION, WE ARE INCLINED TO AGREE WITH OTHER ALLIES (REFTEL F) THAT IT WOULD BE BETTER TO AVOID DISCUSSION WITH NNAS OF EXACT ALLIED POSITION BEFORE FORMER PUT FORWARD THEIR IDEAS. AS THE BASIS FOR A POSITIVE ALLIED RESPONSE TO SUCH AN INITIATIVE, WE AGREE WITH THE EMERGING CONSENSUS AT NATO (REFTEL A) TO USE AN ADJUSTED US OPTION TWO WITH US OPTION ONE SERVING AS A FALLBACK. WHILE US DRAFT OPTION III REMAINS ONE WHICH THE US COULD SUPPORT, WE RECOGNIZE THAT THERE IS LITTLE ALLIED SUPPORT FOR IT AND SEE NO PURPOSE IN FURTHER ALLIED CONSIDERATION OF IT AT THIS TIME. TO FOCUS, AND HOPEFULLY CONCLUDE, ALLIED DISCUSSION OF OPENING MOVEMENTS NOTIFICATION CBM POSITION, THIS MESSAGE PROVIDES NEW TEXTS OF OPTIONS I AND II AS THE BASIS FOR AGREED ALLIED TEXTS FOR USE AS APPROPRIATE

AT BELGRADE.

6. WE BELIEVE IT IMPORTANT THAT WE OBTAIN SOME FORM OF CONCURRENCE BY ALL ALLIES TO MOVEMENTS POSITION NOW BEING DISCUSSED. QUESTION WHETHER ORIGINAL MOVEMENTS DRAFT SHOULD BE ATTACHED TO ISD/149 AS ALLIED PAPER OR AS US PAPER WITH ALLIED COMMENTS (PARAGRAPH 15 OF REFTEL F AND PARAGRAPH EIGHT OF REFTEL G) MAY NOW BE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 249547

MOOT. WE LEAVE TO MISSION TO WORK OUT MOST VIABLE MEANS, BUT NOTE THAT POSITIVE US ATTITUDE WAS PREMISED IN PART ON ALL ALLIES AGREEING TO FULL COORDINATION OF CBM POSITIONS. FYI: IN THIS CONNECTION, WE ARE PLEASED TO SEE ACTIVE AND POSITIVE FRENCH ROLE REPORTED IN RECENT CABLES. END FYI.

7. THE NEW TEXTS INCORPORATE THE CHANGES (REF D) WHICH WE HAVE ALREADY INDICATED WE COULD ACCEPT IN OUR ORIGINAL FORMULATION (REF B) AS WELL AS THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE PHRASE "ACROSS AN INTERNATIONAL FRONTIER" SUGGESTED BY THE DUTCH (PARA 2A, REF B). THEY ARE SOMEWHAT SIMPLER THAN OUR EARLIER TEXTS. IN FORM, OPTION II NOW PARALLELS THE TEXT OF THE MAJOR MANEUVER NOTIFICATION CBM. BECAUSE OPTION I ESTABLISHES A MORE MODEST OBLIGATION AND IS TIED DIRECTLY TO THE MAJOR MANEUVER CBM, IT REQUIRES A LESS ELABORATE FORMULATION.

8. FOLLOWING THE TEXTS AND EXPLANATORY COMMENTS, THIS MESSAGE PROVIDES COMMENTS ON THE FRG AND TURKISH PROPOSALS. (REFS C&D).

9. OPTION II

A. TEXT

(1) THE PARTICIPATING STATES WILL NOTIFY THEIR MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS TO ALL OTHER PARTICIPATING STATES THROUGH USUAL DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING PROVISIONS.

(2) NOTIFICATION WILL BE GIVEN OF THE MOVEMENT INTO OR WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA, AS DEFINED BELOW, OF
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 249547

25,000 OR MORE GROUND TROOPS (IN THIS CONTEXT THE WORD "TROOPS" INCLUDES AMPHIBIOUS AND AIRBORNE TROOPS), IF SUCH TROOPS ARE MOVING FOR A COORDINATED PURPOSE; ARE MOVING IN UNITS OR, IF NOT IN UNITS, ARE MOVING DURING A PERIOD OF 30 CONSECUTIVE DAYS; AND ARE MOVING EITHER

OVER A STRAIGHT-LINE DISTANCE OF MORE THAN 200 KM FROM THE POINT OF ORIGIN, OR FROM THE TERRITORY OF ANOTHER, OR FROM TERRITORY OUTSIDE THE APPLICABLE AREA TO TERRITORY WITHIN IT.

(3) THE APPLICABLE AREA REFERRED TO ABOVE IS THE SAME AS THAT PRESCRIBED FOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVERS IN THE FINAL ACT OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE.

(4) NOTIFICATION WILL BE GIVEN . . . DAYS OR MORE IN ADVANCE OF THE START OF THE MOVEMENT. SHOULD A STATE BE APPREHENSIVE FOR REASONS ARISING FROM LACK OF A CLEAR, TIMELY OR ADEQUATE UNDERSTANDING OF THE REASONS FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF OTHER STATES (OR FOR REASONS INVOLVING ITS OWN INTERNAL SECURITY), THAT STATE MAY GIVE SHORTER ADVANCE NOTIFICATION, FULLY EXPLAINING ITS APPREHENSION TO THE OTHER PARTICIPATING STATES. NOTHING WITHIN THESE REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTIFICATION SHALL IN ANY WAY (OR UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES) BE CONSTRUED AS DEROGATING FROM OR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RIGHTS OF STATES WITH RESPECT TO THEIR EXERCISE OF SELF-DEFENSE UNDER THE UN CHARTER.

(5) NOTIFICATION WILL CONTAIN INFORMATION OF THE DESIGNATION, IF ANY, AND THE GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE MOVEMENT, THE TYPE OR TYPES AND NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE FORCES ENGAGED, THE ESTIMATED TIME FRAME OF THE CONDUCT OF THE MOVEMENT, ITS PLACE OR PLACES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION (IF LOCATED WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA), AND IDENTIFICATION OF THE UNITS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 249547

INVOLVED IN THE MOVEMENT AT THE REGIMENTAL LEVEL AND ABOVE.

B. COMMENTS.

THE FORMAT -- AN INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPH FOLLOWED BY PARAGRAPHS DESCRIBING WHAT IS TO BE NOTIFIED, THE APPLICABLE AREA, THE NOTIFICATION PERIOD AND THE INFORMATION CONTENT OF NOTIFICATIONS -- PARALLELS THAT OF THE CBM ON PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVERS.

-- PARA (1) PICKS UP THE LANGUAGE OF THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THE MAJOR MANEUVERS CBM, SUBSTITUTING "MOVEMENTS" FOR "MANEUVERS."

-- PARA (2) (SEE REF C, PARA 18) HAS BEEN SIMPLIFIED BY DROPPING THE PHRASE "AND REGARDLESS OF THE MODE OF TRANSPORTATION INVOLVED," WHICH MAKES THE FORMULATION

SOMEWHAT LESS EXPLICIT BUT NO LESS ENCOMPASSING, AND

BY ELIMINATING REFERENCE TO THE NOTIFICATION PERIOD,
WHICH IS NOW GIVEN IN PARA (4).

-- IN PARA (2) WE HAVE SUBSTITUTED THE LANGUAGE
PROPOSED BY THE DUTCH (PARA 2A, REF B) FOR OUR PHRASE
"ACROSS AN INTERNATIONAL FRONTIER," IN THE HOPE THAT
THIS MAY BE MORE ACCEPTABLE TO THE FRG (SEE DISCUSSION
IN PARA 7 BELOW).

-- PARA 3 DEFINES THE APPLICABLE AREA BY REFERENCE TO
THE MAJOR MANEUVER CBM. WE ARE STILL EXAMINING
WHETHER THIS MIGHT ENTAIL DIFFICULTIES RELATING TO
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 249547

MOVEMENTS OF AMPHIBIOUS TROOPS (REF D, PARA 9).

-- IN PARA (4), THE NUMBER OF DAYS WHICH IT IS
REQUIRED TO GIVE NOTIFICATION IN ADVANCE IS LEFT OPEN
(REF D, PARA 4) AND THE ESCAPE CLAUSE IS REVISED
TO INCORPORATE SUGGESTIONS MADE BY CANADIAN REP AND
TO ADDRESS THE INTERNAL SECURITY ISSUE RAISED BY
THE ITALIANS (REF D, PARA 7). WE HAVE BRACKETED THE
PHRASE "OR FOR REASONS INVOLVING ITS OWN INTERNAL
SECURITY," SINCE ITS INCLUSION OR EXCLUSION WOULD
EFFECT THE EUROPEAN ALLIES BUT NOT THE US. WE NOTE,
HOWEVER, THE ITALIAN SUGGESTION (PARA 2, REF B) THAT
EXCEPTION FOR INTERNAL SECURITY MOVEMENTS WOULD NOT
BE REQUIRED IF THRESHOLD WERE SET AT 25,000.

-- PARA (5) REPRESENTS A SUBSTANTIAL SIMPLIFICATION
(PER PARA 9, REF A) OF OUR ORIGINAL PROPOSAL FOR THE
INFORMATION CONTENT OF NOTIFICATIONS (PARA 27B, REF C).
IT FOLLOWS CLOSELY THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE FINAL
PARAGRAPH OF THE MAJOR MANEUVERS CBM, WITH ADJUSTMENTS
TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MOVEMENTS AND
MANEUVERS: THE REFERENCE TO "STATES INVOLVED" IS
DROPPED AS NOT GERMANE AND THE PHRASE "ITS PLACE
OR PLACES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION" REPLACES "THE
AREA... OF ITS CONDUCT." A STIPULATION REQUIRING
IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR UNITS, WHICH WAS INCLUDED
IN OUR ORIGINAL FORMULATION AND IS PART OF THE
ALLIES' DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR STRENGTHENING THE
CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS, IS ADDED.

10. OPTION I.

A. TEXT.

(1) WHEN NOTIFYING A MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVER,

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 08 STATE 249547

PARTICIPATING STATES WILL ALSO NOTIFY THE MOVEMENT WITHIN OR INTO THE APPLICABLE AREA, AS DEFINED BELOW, OF ANY GROUND UNIT OR GROUND FORCES OF REGIMENTAL SIZE OR LARGER (E.G., BRIGADES OR DIVISIONS), REGARDLESS OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF TROOPS INVOLVED (IN THIS CONTEXT THE WORD "TROOPS" INCLUDES AMPHIBIOUS AND AIRBORNE TROOPS), WHICH IS STRICTLY LINKED WITH THE EXECUTION OF THE MANEUVER.

(2) THE APPLICABLE AREA REFERRED TO ABOVE IS THE SAME AS THAT PRESCRIBED FOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVERS IN THE FINAL ACT OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE.

(3) IN NOTIFYING SUCH MOVEMENTS, STATES WILL SPECIFY THE UNITS INVOLVED AT THE REGIMENTAL LEVEL AND ABOVE, THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE FORCES MOVED, THE ESTIMATED TIME FRAME OF THE CONDUCT OF THE MOVEMENT, AND ITS PLACE OR PLACES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION (IF LOCATED WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA).

B. COMMENTS.

-- SINCE THE OBLIGATION ESTABLISHED HERE IS DIRECTLY LINKED TO THE EXISTING OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY MAJOR MANEUVERS, THERE IS NO NEED FOR THE INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPH INCLUDED IN OPTION II. IN FACT, SUCH A PARAGRAPH WOULD PROBABLY BE INAPPROPRIATE GIVEN THE MORE LIMITED SCOPE OF THE OBLIGATION.

-- SPECIFICATION OF THE NOTIFICATION PERIOD IS ACCOMPLISHED IN PARA (1) BY THE PHRASE "WHEN NOTIFYING A MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVER". IT WOULD BE INCONSISTENT

PAGE 09 STATE 249547

TO ESTABLISH EITHER A NOTIFICATION PERIOD FOR MOVEMENTS OR AN ESCAPE CLAUSE PERMITTING SHORTER NOTICE WHICH DIFFERED FROM THOSE ALREADY ESTABLISHED FOR THE MAJOR MANEUVERS TO WHICH THE MOVEMENTS IN QUESTION WOULD BE LINKED. FURTHERMORE, THE ARGUMENT FOR NARROWING THE ESCAPE CLAUSE CONTAINED IN THE MAJOR MANEUVER CBM, WHICH SUPPORTS THE FORMULATION IN PARA (4) OF OPTIONS II AND III ABOVE (SEE REF D, PARAS 7 AND 8C), IS LESS APPLICABLE TO OPTION I.

-- THERE IS NO NEED TO INCLUDE IN THE PARAGRAPH SPECIFYING THE CONTENT OF NOTIFICATIONS -- PARA (3) -- EITHER "THE GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE MOVEMENT" OR "THE

TYPE OR TPYES. . .OF THE FORCES ENGAGED". THE FORMER IS SELF-EVIDENT: I.E., TO PARTICIPATE IN THE MAJOR MANEUVER; AND THE LATEER IS ALREADY REQUIRED IN THE NOTIFICATION OF THE MAJOR MANEUVER WITH WHICH THE MOVEMENT IS LINKED.

11. FRG PROPOSAL. FRG TEXT (REF E) PRESENTS A NUMBER OF PROBLEMS, SOME OF WHICH WE HAVE ALREADY STATED IN RESPONDING TO EARLIER GERMAN COMMENTS ON THE US OPTIONS (PARA 6, REF D):

A. AS EXPLAINED IN PARA 6B OF REF A, WE BELIEVE ABSENCE OF PROVISION FOR ACROSS-BORDER MOVEMENTS SERIOUSLY WEAKENS THE CBM AND MAKES IT LESS EFFECTIVE AS AN ALLIED COUNTER TO AN INITIAL NNA FORMULATION. MISSION SHOULD THEREFORE STRONGLY ENCOURAGE SEARCH FOR FORMULA WHICH RETAINS THIS ELEMENT BUT IS CAST IN

TERMS FRG CAN ACCEPT. WE NOTE DUTCH SHARE THIS VIEW (PARA 2A, REF B), AND WE SEE MERIT IN ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE THEY HAVE PROPOSED TO MEET FRG CONCERN. ALTHOUGH FRG REP'S INITIAL UNINSTRUCTED REACTION TO DUTCH PROPOSAL WAS NEGATIVE, WE NOTE THAT IN HIS LATER CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 10 STATE 249547

COMMENT, REPORTED IN REF A, FRG REP SAID IT WAS THE SPECIFIC PHRASE "ACROSS AN INTERNATIONAL FRONTIER" TO WHICH HIS GOVERNMENT OBJECTED. WE WOULD BE INTERESTED IN CLARIFICATION OF FRG VIEW ON DUTCH SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE AND EXPLANATION OF PROBLEM, IF ANY, IT WOULD CREATE. POTENTIAL FREQUENCY OF NOTIFICATIONS IF ACROSS-BORDER MOVEMENTS ARE INCLUDED (SEE FRG COMMENT PARA 2B, REF B) SHOULD NOT BE A PROBLEM IF SIZE THRESHOLD IS SET AT 25,000, AS DEVELOPING ALLIED CONSENSUS APPEARS TO FAVOR. WE NOTE BELGIAN STATEMENT (PARA 2D, REF B) THAT INCLUSION OF FRONTIER CROSSING MOVEMENTS WOULD NOT BE A PROBLEM FOR THEM WITH THRESHOLD OF 25,000.

IF DUTCH LANGUAGE IS UNACCEPTABLE, SOME SUCH ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION AS "MOVEMENTS BETWEEN PARTICIPATING STATES" MIGHT ALSO BE CONSIDERED. IF, HOWEVER, AFTER SUGGESTING THESE ALTERNATIVES MISSION CONCLUDES THAT IT IS NECESSARY TO CONCEDE TO FRG TO ACHIEVE AGREEMENT ON AN ALLIED TEXT, YOU SHOULD PROVIDE WASHINGTON WITH YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS.

B. THE PHRASE (1ST SENTENCE OF FRG TEXT) "NOTIFICATION... OF...MOVEMENTS WITHIN OR INTO THE TERRITORY OF A PARTICIPATING STATE IN EUROPE IN THE SAME MANNER AS FOR MILITARY MANEUVERS" IS AMBIGUOUS. IT COULD BE TAKEN AS EXTENDING THE COVERAGE OF THE CBM TO ALL OF EUROPE

(AN ADMITTED FRG DESIDERATUM), WITH THE WORDS "IN THE SAME MANNER AS" REFERRING TO THE MEANS OF DELIVERY, TIMING, AND CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION. THIS QUESTION WOULD HAVE TO BE CLARIFIED IN NEGOTIATION. WE THINK IT WOULD BE PREFERABLE TO REMOVE THIS AMBIGUITY IN ADVANCE IN WHATEVER LANGUAGE THE ALLIES AGREE UPON.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 11 STATE 249547

C. AS THE UK PROPOSAL, THE FRG TEXT PROVIDES NO BASIS FOR DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN INDEPENDENT SMALLER-SCALE MOVEMENTS AND RELATED ELEMENTS OF A LARGER ONE (SEE PARA 6A, REF E). WITHOUT SOME QUALIFYING REFERENCE, SUCH AS OUR PHRASE "FOR A COORDINATED PURPOSE," THE FRG FORMULATION COULD BE INTERPRETED AS

REQUIRING NOTIFICATION OF SMALLER INDEPENDENT MOVEMENTS TAKING PLACE DURING ANY 30-DAY PERIOD IF, CUMULATIVELY, THEY INVOLVE MORE THAN THE THRESHOLD NUMBER OF TROOPS. THIS POINT ALSO WOULD ALSO HAVE TO BE CLARIFIED IN NEGOTIATION. WE WOULD PREFER A TEXT WHICH ELIMINATES THIS AMBIGUITY.

D. WE CONTINUE TO PREFER A FORMULATION WITH AN ESCAPE CLAUSE WHICH IS NARROWER THAN THAT CONTAINED IN THE MAJOR MANEUVER CBM AND HENCE MORE ENCUMBERING TO A STATE WHICH WANTED TO MOVE TROOPS FOR COERCIVE PURPOSES (PARA 8C, REF D).

E. BY NOT SPECIFYING THE CONTENT OF NOTIFICATIONS, EXCEPT IMPLICITLY BY REFERENCE TO THE MAJOR MANEUVERS CBM, THE FRG FORMULATION WOULD NOT TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE NEED TO IDENTIFY THE PLACE OR PLACES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION OF NOTIFIED MOVEMENTS.

12. TURKISH PROPOSAL (PARA 3, REF B). FOR REASONS ALREADY EXPLAINED (REF D), THE US COULD NOT ACCEPT A 10,000-12,000 THRESHOLD APPLICABLE TO DISAGGREGATED MOVEMENTS OF THE REDUCED DISTANCE THRESHOLD PROPOSED BY THE TURKS.

VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 249547
ORIGIN IO-14

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /015 R

66011
DRAFTED BY:IO:UNA:BJSHARP

APPROVED BY:IO:UNA:GRICE

-----009118 261614Z /70

R 260500Z OCT 77

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION USUN NEW YORK

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 249547

FOR ED MEZVINSKY FROM CONNIE GRICE

FOLLOWING TELEGRAM FROM SECSTATE WASHDC DATED OCTOBER 18, 1977

SENT USNATO INFO CSCE COLLECTIVE IS REPEATED TO YOU: QUOTE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 249547

BELGRADE ALSO FOR USDEL CSCE

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS: OCTOBER 18 POLADS MEETING

REFS (NOTAL): A) USNATO 9797; B) USNATO 9707;

C) STATE 197382; D) STATE 239233; E) USNATO 9466;

F) USNATO 8795; G) STATE 218519

1. WE ARE NOW SEEKING TO CONCLUDE ALLIED DEVELOPMENT OF
OPENING CBMS POSITIONS FOR BELGRADE. THIS MESSAGE
DISCUSSES THE ALLIED MOVEMENTS CBM POSITION. WE ARE
PREPARING SEPTELS WITH US VIEWS ON POST-BELGRADE CBMS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 249547

WORKING GROUP, SWEDISH MILITARY EXPENDITURES REPORTING
INITIATIVE AND LOCUS FOR ALLIED CBMS CONSULTATIONS;
COORDINATED MANEUVERS INITIATIVE; CANADIAN PAPER ON
MILITARY ASPECTS OF DETENTE; JCS PAPER ON CBMS;
REVISED SWEDISH DRAFT RESOLUTION; NORWEGIAN PROPOSAL FOR
TABLING ISD/156; AND ON WARSAW PACT NFU PROPOSAL.
MISSION IS REQUESTED TO INFORM DEPARTMENT SOONEST IF THERE
ARE ANY OTHER TOPICS TO BE COVERED.

2. FYI. FLORA LEWIS REPORTED FROM BELGRADE IN SUNDAY,
OCTOBER 16 NEW YORK TIMES THAT CONSENSUS SEEMS TO BE

SHAPING AMONG SMALLER CSCE PARTICIPANTS (NORWAY, SWEDEN
AND ROMANIA) FOR LOWERING OF CBM MANEUVERS THRESHOLD AND
FOR AN INITIATIVE ON MOVEMENTS. END FYI.

3. CONSTRUCTIVE AND DETAILED ALLIED DISCUSSION
(REFTELS A AND B) OF U.S. DRAFT MOVEMENTS PAPER HAS
BEEN MOST HELPFUL TO OUR OWN CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUE

AND TO OUR DESIRE, AS THE NATO PARTNER WITH THE LARGEST NUMBER OF PERSONNEL MOVING IN AND OUT OF THE AREA, TO COOPERATE IN ENSURING THAT THE ALLIANCE WILL HAVE A FULLY COORDINATED POSITION ON A MOVEMENTS CBM AT BELGRADE.

4. AS A RESULT OF THESE DISCUSSIONS, WE CONCLUDE THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD SEEK TO BE POSITIVE ON A MOVEMENTS CBM INITIATIVE AT BELGRADE. ALLIED ADVANCE OF SUCH AN INITIATIVE WOULD, HOWEVER, REPRESENT TOO MUCH OF AN "EVENT". IT WOULD PUT THE ALLIES IN THE

POSITION OF HAVING TO DEFEND A MOVEMENTS POSITION, RATHER THAN HAVING THE OPTION OF ESPOUSING OTHER INITIATIVE CRITIQUING IT OR SUGGESTING AN ALTERNATIVE OF OUR OWN.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 249547

ADVANCING AN INITIATIVE COULD, MORE IMPORTANTLY, PLACE THE ALLIES IN AN UNDESIRED TACTICAL SITUATION AT BELGRADE. FOR EXAMPLE, WE WOULD LIKELY SOON BE FACED WITH THE NECESSITY OF REJECTING REQUESTS BY OTHER CSCE PARTICIPANTS TO ENLARGE OUR MOVEMENTS INITIATIVE BEYOND LIMITS DETERMINED BY NATO FLEXIBILITY AND PREPAREDNESS.

5. WE THUS CONCLUDE FURTHER THAT THE BEST ALLIED TACTIC AT BELGRADE WOULD BE TO SUPPORT, IN PRINCIPLE, A MOVEMENTS CBM INITIATIVE ADVANCED BY ONE, OR A GROUP OF NNAS. IN THIS CONNECTION, WE ARE INCLINED TO AGREE WITH OTHER ALLIES (REFTEL F) THAT IT WOULD BE BETTER TO AVOID DISCUSSION WITH NNAS OF EXACT ALLIED POSITION BEFORE FORMER PUT FORWARD THEIR IDEAS. AS THE BASIS FOR A POSITIVE ALLIED RESPONSE TO SUCH AN INITIATIVE, WE AGREE WITH THE EMERGING CONSENSUS AT NATO (REFTEL A) TO USE AN ADJUSTED US OPTION TWO WITH US OPTION ONE SERVING AS A FALLBACK. WHILE US DRAFT OPTION III REMAINS ONE WHICH THE US COULD SUPPORT, WE RECOGNIZE THAT THERE IS LITTLE ALLIED SUPPORT FOR IT AND SEE NO PURPOSE IN FURTHER ALLIED CONSIDERATION OF IT AT THIS TIME. TO FOCUS, AND HOPEFULLY CONCLUDE, ALLIED DISCUSSION OF OPENING MOVEMENTS NOTIFICATION CBM POSITION, THIS MESSAGE PROVIDES NEW TEXTS OF OPTIONS I AND II AS THE BASIS FOR AGREED ALLIED TEXTS FOR USE AS APPROPRIATE AT BELGRADE.

6. WE BELIEVE IT IMPORTANT THAT WE OBTAIN SOME FORM OF CONCURRENCE BY ALL ALLIES TO MOVEMENTS POSITION NOW BEING DISCUSSED. QUESTION WHETHER ORIGINAL MOVEMENTS DRAFT SHOULD BE ATTACHED TO ISD/149 AS ALLIED PAPER OR AS US PAPER WITH ALLIED COMMENTS (PARAGRAPH 15 OF REFTTEL F AND PARAGRAPH EIGHT OF REFTTEL G) MAY NOW BE MOOT. WE LEAVE TO MISSION TO WORK OUT MOST VIABLE MEANS, BUT NOTE THAT POSITIVE US ATTITUDE WAS PREMISED IN PART ON ALL ALLIES AGREEING TO FULL COORDINATION OF CBM POSITIONS. FYI: IN THIS CONNECTION, WE ARE PLEASED

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 249547

TO SEE ACTIVE AND POSITIVE FRENCH ROLE REPORTED IN
RECENT CABLES. END FYI.

7. THE NEW TEXTS INCORPORATE THE CHANGES (REF D) WHICH
WE HAVE ALREADY INDICATED WE COULD ACCEPT IN OUR
ORIGINAL FORMULATION (REF B) AS WELL AS THE ALTERNATIVE
TO THE PHRASE "ACROSS AN INTERNATIONAL FRONTIER"
SUGGESTED BY THE DUTCH (PARA 2A, REF B). THEY ARE
SOMEWHAT SIMPLER THAN OUR EARLIER TEXTS. IN FORM,
OPTION II NOW PARALLELS THE TEXT OF THE MAJOR MANEUVER
NOTIFICATION CBM. BECAUSE OPTION I ESTABLISHES A MORE
MODEST OBLIGATION AND IS TIED DIRECTLY TO THE MAJOR
MANEUVER CBM, IT REQUIRES A LESS ELABORATE FORMULATION.

8. FOLLOWING THE TEXTS AND EXPLANATORY COMMENTS, THIS
MESSAGE PROVIDES COMMENTS ON THE FRG AND TURKISH
PROPOSALS. (REFS C&D).

9. OPTION II

A. TEXT

(1) THE PARTICIPATING STATES WILL NOTIFY THEIR MAJOR
MILITARY MOVEMENTS TO ALL OTHER PARTICIPATING STATES
THROUGH USUAL DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS IN ACCORDANCE WITH
THE FOLLOWING PROVISIONS.

(2) NOTIFICATION WILL BE GIVEN OF THE MOVEMENT INTO
OR WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA, AS DEFINED BELOW, OF
25,000 OR MORE GROUND TROOPS (IN THIS CONTEXT THE WORD
"TROOPS" INCLUDES AMPHIBIOUS AND AIRBORNE TROOPS), IF
SUCH TROOPS ARE MOVING FOR A COORDINATED PURPOSE; ARE
MOVING IN UNITS OR, IF NOT IN UNITS, ARE MOVING DURING
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 249547

A PERIOD OF 30 CONSECUTIVE DAYS; AND ARE MOVING EITHER
OVER A STRAIGHT-LINE DISTANCE OF MORE THAN 200 KM FROM
THE POINT OF ORIGIN, OR FROM THE TERRITORY OF ANOTHER,
OR FROM TERRITORY OUTSIDE THE APPLICABLE AREA TO
TERRITORY WITHIN IT.

(3) THE APPLICABLE AREA REFERRED TO ABOVE IS THE SAME
AS THAT PRESCRIBED FOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY
MANEUVERS IN THE FINAL ACT OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY
AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE.

(4) NOTIFICATION WILL BE GIVEN . . . DAYS OR MORE IN
ADVANCE OF THE START OF THE MOVEMENT. SHOULD A STATE BE

APPREHENSIVE FOR REASONS ARISING FROM LACK OF A CLEAR, TIMELY OR ADEQUATE UNDERSTANDING OF THE REASONS FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF OTHER STATES (OR FOR REASONS INVOLVING ITS OWN INTERNAL SECURITY), THAT STATE MAY GIVE SHORTER ADVANCE NOTIFICATION, FULLY EXPLAINING ITS APPREHENSION TO THE OTHER PARTICIPATING STATES. NOTHING WITHIN THESE REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTIFICATION SHALL IN ANY WAY (OR UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES) BE CONSTRUED AS DEROGATING FROM OR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RIGHTS OF STATES WITH RESPECT TO THEIR EXERCISE OF SELF-DEFENSE UNDER THE UN CHARTER.

(5) NOTIFICATION WILL CONTAIN INFORMATION OF THE DESIGNATION, IF ANY, AND THE GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE MOVEMENT, THE TYPE OR TYPES AND NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE FORCES ENGAGED, THE ESTIMATED TIME FRAME OF THE CONDUCT OF THE MOVEMENT, ITS PLACE OR PLACES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION (IF LOCATED WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA), AND IDENTIFICATION OF THE UNITS INVOLVED IN THE MOVEMENT AT THE REGIMENTAL LEVEL AND ABOVE.

B. COMMENTS.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 249547

THE FORMAT -- AN INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPH FOLLOWED BY PARAGRAPHS DESCRIBING WHAT IS TO BE NOTIFIED, THE APPLICABLE AREA, THE NOTIFICATION PERIOD AND THE INFORMATION CONTENT OF NOTIFICATIONS -- PARALLELS THAT OF THE CBM ON PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVERS.

-- PARA (1) PICKS UP THE LANGUAGE OF THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THE MAJOR MANEUVERS CBM, SUBSTITUTING "MOVEMENTS" FOR "MANEUVERS."

-- PARA (2) (SEE REF C, PARA 18) HAS BEEN SIMPLIFIED BY DROPPING THE PHRASE "AND REGARDLESS OF THE MODE OF TRANSPORTATION INVOLVED," WHICH MAKES THE FORMULATION SOMEWHAT LESS EXPLICIT BUT NO LESS ENCOMPASSING, AND

BY ELIMINATING REFERENCE TO THE NOTIFICATION PERIOD, WHICH IS NOW GIVEN IN PARA (4).

-- IN PARA (2) WE HAVE SUBSTITUTED THE LANGUAGE PROPOSED BY THE DUTCH (PARA 2A, REF B) FOR OUR PHRASE "ACROSS AN INTERNATIONAL FRONTIER," IN THE HOPE THAT THIS MAY BE MORE ACCEPTABLE TO THE FRG (SEE DISCUSSION IN PARA 7 BELOW).

-- PARA 3 DEFINES THE APPLICABLE AREA BY REFERENCE TO THE MAJOR MANEUVER CBM. WE ARE STILL EXAMINING

WHETHER THIS MIGHT ENTAIL DIFFICULTIES RELATING TO
MOVEMENTS OF AMPHIBIOUS TROOPS (REF D, PARA 9).

-- IN PARA (4), THE NUMBER OF DAYS WHICH IT IS
REQUIRED TO GIVE NOTIFICATION IN ADVANCE IS LEFT OPEN
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 249547

(REF D, PARA 4) AND THE ESCAPE CLAUSE IS REVISED
TO INCORPORATE SUGGESTIONS MADE BY CANADIAN REP AND
TO ADDRESS THE INTERNAL SECURITY ISSUE RAISED BY
THE ITALIANS (REF D, PARA 7). WE HAVE BRACKETED THE
PHRASE "OR FOR REASONS INVOLVING ITS OWN INTERNAL
SECURITY," SINCE ITS INCLUSION OR EXCLUSION WOULD
EFFECT THE EUROPEAN ALLIES BUT NOT THE US. WE NOTE,
HOWEVER, THE ITALIAN SUGGESTION (PARA 2, REF B) THAT
EXCEPTION FOR INTERNAL SECURITY MOVEMENTS WOULD NOT
BE REQUIRED IF THRESHOLD WERE SET AT 25,000.

-- PARA (5) REPRESENTS A SUBSTANTIAL SIMPLIFICATION
(PER PARA 9, REF A) OF OUR ORIGINAL PROPOSAL FOR THE
INFORMATION CONTENT OF NOTIFICATIONS (PARA 27B, REF C).
IT FOLLOWS CLOSELY THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE FINAL
PARAGRAPH OF THE MAJOR MANEUVERS CBM, WITH ADJUSTMENTS
TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MOVEMENTS AND
MANEUVERS: THE REFERENCE TO "STATES INVOLVED" IS
DROPPED AS NOT GERMANE AND THE PHRASE "ITS PLACE
OR PLACES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION" REPLACES "THE
AREA. . . OF ITS CONDUCT." A STIPULATION REQUIRING
IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR UNITS, WHICH WAS INCLUDED
IN OUR ORIGINAL FORMULATION AND IS PART OF THE
ALLIES' DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR STRENGTHENING THE
CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS, IS ADDED.

10. OPTION I.

A. TEXT.

(1) WHEN NOTIFYING A MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVER,

PARTICIPATING STATES WILL ALSO NOTIFY THE MOVEMENT
WITHIN OR INTO THE APPLICABLE AREA, AS DEFINED BELOW,
OF ANY GROUND UNIT OR GROUND FORCES OF REGIMENTAL SIZE
OR LARGER (E.G., BRIGADES OR DIVISIONS), REGARDLESS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 08 STATE 249547

OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF TROOPS INVOLVED (IN THIS CONTEXT
THE WORD "TROOPS" INCLUDES AMPHIBIOUS AND AIRBORNE
TROOPS), WHICH IS STRICTLY LINKED WITH THE EXECUTION
OF THE MANEUVER.

(2) THE APPLICABLE AREA REFERRED TO ABOVE IS THE SAME AS THAT PRESCRIBED FOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVERS IN THE FINAL ACT OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE.

(3) IN NOTIFYING SUCH MOVEMENTS, STATES WILL SPECIFY THE UNITS INVOLVED AT THE REGIMENTAL LEVEL AND ABOVE, THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE FORCES MOVED, THE ESTIMATED TIME FRAME OF THE CONDUCT OF THE MOVEMENT, AND ITS PLACE OR PLACES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION (IF LOCATED WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA).

B. COMMENTS.

-- SINCE THE OBLIGATION ESTABLISHED HERE IS DIRECTLY LINKED TO THE EXISTING OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY MAJOR MANEUVERS, THERE IS NO NEED FOR THE INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPH INCLUDED IN OPTION II. IN FACT, SUCH A PARAGRAPH WOULD PROBABLY BE INAPPROPRIATE GIVEN THE MORE LIMITED SCOPE OF THE OBLIGATION.

-- SPECIFICATION OF THE NOTIFICATION PERIOD IS ACCOMPLISHED IN PARA (1) BY THE PHRASE "WHEN NOTIFYING A MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVER". IT WOULD BE INCONSISTENT TO ESTABLISH EITHER A NOTIFICATION PERIOD FOR MOVEMENTS OR AN ESCAPE CLAUSE PERMITTING SHORTER NOTICE WHICH DIFFERED FROM THOSE ALREADY ESTABLISHED FOR THE MAJOR MANEUVERS TO WHICH THE MOVEMENTS IN QUESTION WOULD

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 09 STATE 249547

BE LINKED. FURTHERMORE, THE ARGUMENT FOR NARROWING THE ESCAPE CLAUSE CONTAINED IN THE MAJOR MANEUVER CBM, WHICH SUPPORTS THE FORMULATION IN PARA (4) OF OPTIONS II AND III ABOVE (SEE REF D, PARAS 7 AND 8C), IS LESS APPLICABLE TO OPTION I.

-- THERE IS NO NEED TO INCLUDE IN THE PARAGRAPH SPECIFYING THE CONTENT OF NOTIFICATIONS -- PARA (3) -- EITHER "THE GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE MOVEMENT" OR "THE TYPE OR TYPES...OF THE FORCES ENGAGED". THE FORMER IS SELF-EVIDENT: I.E., TO PARTICIPATE IN THE MAJOR MANEUVER; AND THE LATTER IS ALREADY REQUIRED IN THE NOTIFICATION OF THE MAJOR MANEUVER WITH WHICH THE MOVEMENT IS LINKED.

11. FRG PROPOSAL. FRG TEXT (REF E) PRESENTS A NUMBER OF PROBLEMS, SOME OF WHICH WE HAVE ALREADY STATED IN RESPONDING TO EARLIER GERMAN COMMENTS ON THE US OPTIONS (PARA 6, REF D):

A. AS EXPLAINED IN PARA 6B OF REF A, WE BELIEVE ABSENCE OF PROVISION FOR ACROSS-BORDER MOVEMENTS

SERIOUSLY WEAKENS THE CBM AND MAKES IT LESS EFFECTIVE AS AN ALLIED COUNTER TO AN INITIAL NNA FORMULATION. MISSION SHOULD THEREFORE STRONGLY ENCOURAGE SEARCH FOR FORMULA WHICH RETAINS THIS ELEMENT BUT IS CAST IN

TERMS FRG CAN ACCEPT. WE NOTE DUTCH SHARE THIS VIEW (PARA 2A, REF B), AND WE SEE MERIT IN ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE THEY HAVE PROPOSED TO MEET FRG CONCERN. ALTHOUGH FRG REP'S INITIAL UNINSTRUCTED REACTION TO DUTCH PROPOSAL WAS NEGATIVE, WE NOTE THAT IN HIS LATER COMMENT, REPORTED IN REF A, FRG REP SAID IT WAS THE SPECIFIC PHRASE "ACROSS AN INTERNATIONAL FRONTIER" TO WHICH HIS GOVERNMENT OBJECTED. WE WOULD BE INTERESTED IN CLARIFICATION OF FRG VIEW ON DUTCH CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 10 STATE 249547

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE AND EXPLANATION OF PROBLEM, IF ANY, IT WOULD CREATE. POTENTIAL FREQUENCY OF NOTIFICATIONS IF ACROSS-BORDER MOVEMENTS ARE INCLUDED (SEE FRG COMMENT PARA 2B, REF B) SHOULD NOT BE A PROBLEM IF SIZE THRESHOLD IS SET AT 25,000, AS DEVELOPING ALLIED CONSENSUS APPEARS TO FAVOR. WE NOTE BELGIAN STATEMENT (PARA 2D, REF B) THAT INCLUSION OF FRONTIER CROSSING MOVEMENTS WOULD NOT BE A PROBLEM FOR THEM WITH THRESHOLD OF 25,000.

IF DUTCH LANGUAGE IS UNACCEPTABLE, SOME SUCH ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION AS "MOVEMENTS BETWEEN PARTICIPATING STATES" MIGHT ALSO BE CONSIDERED. IF, HOWEVER, AFTER SUGGESTING THESE ALTERNATIVES MISSION CONCLUDES THAT IT IS NECESSARY TO CONCEDE TO FRG TO ACHIEVE AGREEMENT ON AN ALLIED TEXT, YOU SHOULD PROVIDE WASHINGTON WITH YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS.

B. THE PHRASE (1ST SENTENCE OF FRG TEXT) "NOTIFICATION... OF...MOVEMENTS WITHIN OR INTO THE TERRITORY OF A PARTICIPATING STATE IN EUROPE IN THE SAME MANNER AS FOR MILITARY MANEUVERS" IS AMBIGUOUS. IT COULD BE TAKEN AS EXTENDING THE COVERAGE OF THE CBM TO ALL OF EUROPE (AN ADMITTED FRG DESIDERATUM), WITH THE WORDS "IN THE SAME MANNER AS" REFERRING TO THE MEANS OF DELIVERY, TIMING, AND CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION. THIS QUESTION WOULD HAVE TO BE CLARIFIED IN NEGOTIATION. WE THINK IT WOULD BE PREFERABLE TO REMOVE THIS AMBIGUITY IN ADVANCE IN WHATEVER LANGUAGE THE ALLIES AGREE UPON.

C. AS THE UK PROPOSAL, THE FRG TEXT PROVIDES NO BASIS FOR DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN INDEPENDENT SMALLER-SCALE MOVEMENTS AND RELATED ELEMENTS OF A LARGER CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 11 STATE 249547

ONE (SEE PARA 6A, REF E). WITHOUT SOME QUALIFYING REFERENCE, SUCH AS OUR PHRASE "FOR A COORDINATED PURPOSE," THE FRG FORMULATION COULD BE INTERPRETED AS

REQUIRING NOTIFICATION OF SMALLER INDEPENDENT MOVEMENTS TAKING PLACE DURING ANY 30-DAY PERIOD IF, CUMULATIVELY, THEY INVOLVE MORE THAN THE THRESHOLD NUMBER OF TROOPS. THIS POINT ALSO WOULD ALSO HAVE TO BE CLARIFIED IN NEGOTIATION. WE WOULD PREFER A TEXT WHICH ELIMINATES THIS AMBIGUITY.

D. WE CONTINUE TO PREFER A FORMULATION WITH AN ESCAPE CLAUSE WHICH IS NARROWER THAN THAT CONTAINED IN THE MAJOR MANEUVER CBM AND HENCE MORE ENCUMBERING TO A STATE WHICH WANTED TO MOVE TROOPS FOR COERCIVE PURPOSES (PARA 8C, REF D).

E. BY NOT SPECIFYING THE CONTENT OF NOTIFICATIONS, EXCEPT IMPLICITLY BY REFERENCE TO THE MAJOR MANEUVERS CBM, THE FRG FORMULATION WOULD NOT TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE NEED TO IDENTIFY THE PLACE OR PLACES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION OF NOTIFIED MOVEMENTS.

12. TURKISH PROPOSAL (PARA 3, REF B). FOR REASONS ALREADY EXPLAINED (REF D), THE US COULD NOT ACCEPT A 10,000-12,000 THRESHOLD APPLICABLE TO DISAGGREGATED MOVEMENTS OF THE REDUCED DISTANCE THRESHOLD PROPOSED BY THE TURKS.

VANCE UNQUOTE VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 22-Sep-1999 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ALLIANCE, POLICIES, MISSILES, MILITARY CAPABILITIES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 18-Oct-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977STATE249547
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: EUR/RPM:PSBWIER
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: D770388-0039, D770381-0869
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t197710108/baaaeuax.tel
Line Count: 845
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 089dc924-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN ACDA
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 16
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 22-Mar-2005 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 754425
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE/CBMS: OCTOBER 18 POLADS MEETING
TAGS: PARM, MOPS, US, CSCE, NATO
To: USNATO INFO CSCE COLLECTIVE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/089dc924-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009